

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,542	03/30/2004	Guohua Li	09792909-5859	5327
	7590 12/18/2006 SIN NATH & ROSENT	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			DOVE, TRACY MAE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	-
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/18/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	·	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/813,542	LI, GUOHUA
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tracy Dove	1745
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICER 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONOR statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	30 March 2004.	•
· · · · _	This action is non-final.	•
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur	·	• •
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the applica	ition.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obj	jected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o	correction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	} 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 Certified copies of the priority docu 	ments have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docu		
Copies of the certified copies of the	e priority documents have been	received in this National Stage
application from the International E	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not	received.
AM-sharry ()		
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) [1]	Summary (PTO 442)
 1)	4) 🔲 Interview S 88) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	 '

Art Unit: 1745

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)/103(a) as being anticipated by, and alternatively unpatentable over, Fukai et al., JP 2001-122628.

Fukai teaches a lithium ion secondary battery comprising a lithium-manganese multi-component oxide particulate positive electrode active material composition. The composition has the formula $\text{Li}_x \text{Mn}_{1-y-z} \text{M}_y \text{N}_z \text{O}_a$ wherein M denotes Cr and/or Al and N may be Mg or Ti. In the formula, $0.8 \le x \le 1.2$, $0 < y \le 0.2$, $0 \le z \le 0.2$ and $1.8 \le a \le 2.3$ (abstract). Fukai teaches M may be a mixture of Cr and Al when z=0 (0079,0081). The oxide is obtained by mixing materials with water as a dispersion medium (0060). Thus the claims are anticipated.

Art Unit: 1745

The claims are alternatively unpatentable. A 35 U.S.C. 102/103 combination rejection is permitted if it is unclear if the reference teaches the range with "sufficient specificity." The examiner must, in this case, provide reasons for anticipation as well as a motivational statement regarding obviousness. Ex parte Lee, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) (expanded Board). The courts have ruled where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Swain et al., 33 CCPA 1250, 156 F.2d 239, 70 USPO 412. The courts have held that a limitation merely with respect to proportions in a composition of matter or process will not support patentability unless such limitation is "critical". Minerals Separation, Ltd. v. Hyde, 242 U.S. 261 (1916).

Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukai et al., JP 2001-122628.

Fukai teaches a lithium ion secondary battery comprising a lithium-manganese multicomponent oxide particulate positive electrode active material composition. The composition has the formula Li_xMn_{1-y-z} M_yN_zO_a wherein M denotes Cr and/or Al and N may be Mg or Ti. In the formula, $0.8 \le x \le 1.2$, $0 \le y \le 0.2$, $0 \le z \le 0.2$ and $1.8 \le a \le 2.3$ (abstract). Fukai teaches M may be a mixture of Cr and Al when z=0 (0079,0081). The oxide is obtained by mixing materials with water as a dispersion medium (0060)...

Fukai does not teach the claimed range for f (manganese) or g (chromium). However, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because claims that differ from the prior art only by slightly different

Application/Control Number: 10/813,542

Art Unit: 1745

Page 4

(non-overlapping) ranges are prima facie obvious without a showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art. See In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685 (Fed. Cir. 1996) Claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art. Fukai teaches y and z can be at most 0.2, thus, manganese cannot be less than 0.6, which is slightly outside the claimed range of 0.2-0.5 for manganese.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracy Dove whose telephone number is 571-272-1285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 13, 2006